

Appl. No. 10/690,512
Amdt. dated April 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 7, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1) Summary of Prosecution

Claims 1 to 13 are pending in the application.

In the Office action, the Applicant is asked to restrict the application to one invention to a single disclosed species. The Examiner suggests seven groups from which to elect, namely:

Group I	Fig. 3
Group II	Fig. 3B
Group III	Fig. 3C
Group IV	Fig. 3D
Group V	Fig. 3E
Group VI	Fig. 3F
Group VII	Fig. 3G

2) Election

Applicant provisionally elects with traverse the species of Fig. 3. Claims 1 - 5, 7, 8 and 10 - 13 read on this species.

3) Traverse of Requirement for Restriction

An objective of a restriction of the claims, or an election of species, is to not impose an unfair searching burden on the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully submits that the searching required for any of the species identified by the Examiner would appear to cover much the same ground, with little, if any, additional searching required to address the various alternatives.

TDO-RED #8269796 v. 1194133-340258

Appl. No. 10/690,512
Amdt. dated April 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 7, 2005

The Applicant therefore requests that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn.

4) Closing Remarks

In view of the above comments, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
McCARTHY TÉTRAULT LLP

By Brian W. Gray
Brian W. Gray (Reg. No. 30,017)
Tel.: (416) 601-7532

TDO-RED #8269796 v. 1194133-340258